



**Charter School Authorizer Evaluations
Evaluator Guide
2021**

Contents

About this Document.....	1
Purpose	2
Product	2
Ratings.....	3
Evaluation Staffing	4
Evaluation Team Responsibilities	4
Code of Conduct	4
Tennessee Open Records Act	4
Conflicts of Interest	4
Document Folder.....	4
Evaluation Cycle – Each Authorizer.....	5
Pre-Evaluation	5
Steps in the Process.....	5
Completion of Evaluation	8
Document Review – (Days One & Two)	9
School Leader Documentation Debrief & Pre-Debrief Call (Day Three)	10
Authorizer Documentation Debrief (Day Four)	11
Consensus Call (Day Four)	13
Report-Out Preliminary Ratings (Day Five)	15
Writing (Day Five & Six).....	16
Authorizer Documents and Submission Process	18
School Leader Interview Script.....	19
Authorizer Document Debrief Script.....	20

About this Document

This document provides supplementary guidance to the Tennessee State Board of Education (State Board) authorizer evaluators and is aligned to State Board training materials. This guide will be updated periodically; evaluators should always rely on the most recent form of guidance.

Part I: Introduction

The Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation is based on quality practices as defined by the State Board's [Quality Charter Authorizing Standards](#). The Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric and evaluation process is designed by SchoolWorks and State Board staff and is based on authorizing best practices as well as on the expertise that SchoolWorks brings to the process. A task force comprised of State Board staff, authorizer representatives from Metro Nashville Public Schools, Shelby County Schools, Achievement School District, Knoxville County Schools, and Hamilton County Schools, as well as representatives from the Tennessee Charter School Center and the Nashville Charter Collaborative assisted in the development of the State Board's evaluation process.

SchoolWorks, an education consulting company with national experience in charter school authorizer accountability, was contracted by the State Board to produce independent scoring of the 24 rubric standards within the approved Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric for all Tennessee charter school authorizers. Pilot evaluations were conducted in Fall 2020 and served as a baseline to gauge thresholds for overall ratings. The State Board and SchoolWorks worked together to develop an orientation, training, and reliable evaluation process for consistent use in all evaluations.

Process

Beginning in Fall 2021, the State Board will conduct formal evaluations of authorizers. Evaluations will be staggered and occur at least bi-annually, with a cohort of authorizers evaluated in 2021 and a second cohort of authorizers in 2022. This sequence repeats into the future. During an evaluation year, authorizers will submit documents in advance and participate in a documentation debrief during a predetermined timeframe. During a non-evaluation year, authorizers may choose to participate as an evaluator on one evaluation team, and authorizer team member assignments will be staggered in subsequent evaluation cycles.

Evaluation teams initially consider only the documented evidence submitted for the evaluation to determine rubric scores of two or higher on each standard. After an initial evaluation of submitted materials, authorizers will engage in a document debrief with the evaluation team for the purpose of understanding documentation. The evaluation team will also interview the school leaders of the authorizer's charter schools for the purpose of understanding the authorizer's practices.

After considering the documentation as well as evidence shared during the document debrief and school leader interview, evaluators will determine final scores, defaulting to a rating of zero – the lowest score – when no documents or evidence are provided to address a given standard. Evaluators determine which performance level of the rubric best represents the authorizer's practice.

The final outcome for an evaluation is the evaluation report which provides brief statements to describe the nature of the documented evidence. These brief statements also note cases in which no relevant documents were provided by the authorizer.

While a common process to ensure a consistent and normed evaluation has been collaboratively developed by the State Board and SchoolWorks, evaluations of the 24 rubric standards for each authorizer will be conducted solely by the evaluation teams and represent an independent evaluation of each authorizer's practice in relation to the rubrics' standards.

Purpose

The evaluation team is responsible for objectively evaluating the evidence documentation submitted for a given authorizer by comparing the evidence of the documentation of the authorizer’s processes and performance against the rubric. Documentation considered for the evaluation is limited to the documents submitted by the authorizer, the school leader interview, and the documentation debrief. If an authorizer has participated in an appeal process during the review term, the findings and recommendation report and appellant body’s decision will also be considered.

Product

The evaluation is based on the 24 Tennessee Quality Charter Authorizing Standards, which will be rated in 5 categories (e.g., 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a). The evaluation process rating is based on the evaluation team’s consideration of standards (not principles, advanced standards, or sub-standards). Category/Standard #6, Advanced Standards, will only be considered as bonus points.

Categories:

1. Agency Commitment and Capacity
2. Application Process and Decision Making
3. Performance Contracting
4. Ongoing Oversight and Evaluation
5. Revocation and Renewal Decision Making
6. *Advanced Standards (Bonus)*

The final product of each evaluation is a completed Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric with final ratings and evaluative comments (completed by the Evaluation Lead and Team Members) as displayed in Chart A. The State Board’s Quality Editor evaluates and verifies the evidence and rating for each standard (e.g., Standard 2a - Application proposal information, questions, and guidance).

Chart A:

Standard 1a - Planning and Commitment to Excellence		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Supports and advances the purposes of charter school law.					
ii.	Ensures that the authorizer’s local board of education or authorizing board, leadership, and staff understand and are committed to the quality charter authorizing principles and standards and developing as authorizing professionals.					
iii.	Defines external relationships and lines of authority to protect its authorizing functions from conflicts of interest and political influence.					
iv.	Implements policies, processes, and practices that streamline and systematize its work toward stated goals, and executes its duties efficiently while minimizing administrative burdens on schools.					
v.	Evaluates its work regularly against national and state standards for quality authorizing and recognized effective practices, and develops and implements timely plans for improvement when necessary.					
vi.	States a clear mission for quality authorizing.					
vii.	Makes authorizing decisions that will result in positive student outcomes, in accordance with state law.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

Ratings

Rating each standard

Each standard is rated by the evaluation team as 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4, and each standard is made up of sub-standards. Sub-standards within each standard are considered as met or not met. The rating scale is used to differentiate between the evidence the evaluators need to consider to differentiate quality between authorizers.

The State Board has set a specific standard of evidence that must be followed for this evaluation.

- Only documented practices can serve as evidence to determine a rating of two or greater on the rubric.
 - Accept all documents, even if developed by outside entities, as the authorizer’s documents.
 - If you have conflicting documents, use your professional judgment to determine which document contains stronger evidence.
 - A single document may serve as sufficient evidence of a practice. Authorizers vary greatly in the number of schools they oversee, so you may anticipate more examples from a larger authorizer, but you may use a single document as evidence to justify a score.
- Narratives describing practice are most useful when accompanied by direct documentation. For example, a narrative describing the charter application and process unaccompanied by the actual application document can only achieve a rating of one.
- The document debrief is an opportunity for an authorizer to identify how the documentation uploaded for the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation aligns with the criteria within the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric. Documentation takes priority to explanations by the authorizer during the documentation debrief. For example, an authorizer may verbally explain how they handle conflicts of interest in a convincing and coherent manner, but if no documentation is provided to corroborate their verbal comments, there would be no impact on your scoring.
 - In this case, acknowledge the documentation debrief evidence, and then state that there is no documentation to support this practice. EXAMPLE: “While the authorizer verbally described collecting data from the Dean of Academics during onsite reviews, authorizer documentation does not corroborate this practice.”
 - Conversely, if an authorizer submits an excellent document, but in the documentation debrief, it becomes clear that the authorizer does not understand the document, evaluators will still base the rating on the document. No clarifying statement should be made in the report.

When determining the rating for a standard, the review team considers three things: 1. Whether the authorizer has explained practices in the documentation debrief or narrative; 2. Whether documentation consistent with the standard is present; and 3. Whether the quality of the documentation aligns with the standards.

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Authorizer’s Overall Rating:

As an outcome of the evaluation, each authorizer earns an individual overall rating. This overall rating is determined by evaluation team’s ratings of standards and noted by a number representing their percent alignment to the State Board’s Quality Charter Authorizing Standards. Each of the 24 individual standards can earn up to 4 points, none weighted. Four (4) extra credit points are possible via the advanced standards. The overall rating is the average score of the standards. For example: Authorizer X’s Overall Rating = 2.67

Score	Rating
3.5 – 4.0	Exemplary
3.0 – 3.49	Commendable
2.0 – 2.99	Satisfactory
1.0 – 1.99	Approaching Satisfactory
0 – 0.99	Unsatisfactory/Incomplete

Evaluation Staffing

Evaluation Team Roles and Support

Evaluation Lead (*Evaluation Team*) – Reviews all documents, generates rubric ratings, reviews team member rubrics, facilitates the school leader interview and documentation debrief, presents during the consensus meeting and report out, writes the evaluation report, and responds to quality editor’s report feedback.

Team Members (*Evaluation Team*) – Reviews all documents, generates rubric ratings, takes notes during the document debrief and school leader interview, and participates in the consensus meeting.

Quality Editor – Participates in the consensus meeting, reviews the draft report and, if needed, reviews updated report from lead. This role can be combined with the role of Project Manager.

Project Manager – Manages evaluation logistics, schedules all meetings and interviews, reviews and edits the final report, shares the report with authorizer, and updates the report to reflect authorizer’s feedback. This role can be combined with the role of Quality Editor.

Copy Editor – Copy edits the report. It is recommended that this role is assigned to someone who is completely removed from the process.

Evaluation Team Responsibilities

Evaluation:

- Review ALL documents submitted by the authorizer.
- Compare all evidence relevant to each standard against the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric.
- Discuss the evidence and reach a consensus on ratings.
- Evaluation Lead finalizes the rubric based on the consensus meeting with his/her team members.

Abide by the Code of Conduct

1. Carry out work with integrity.
 - a. Treat all those you encounter with courtesy and sensitivity. Try to minimize stress.
 - b. Allay anxiety through mutual respect and valuing opinions. Show an interest in what is said/presented.
 - c. Focus attention and questions on topics that will reveal the quality of an authorizer’s practices.
2. Act in the best interests of authorizers.
 - a. Do not put participants in a position where they may have conflicting loyalties.
 - b. Evaluations are confidential until their public release.
 - c. Try to understand what authorizers are doing and why. Be supportive.
3. Be objective; base findings on evidence, not opinion.
 - a. Evaluations must be robust, fully supported by evidence, defensible, and must inform the ratings.
 - b. Evaluations must be reliable in that others would make the same conclusion from the same evidence.

Keep Aware of the Tennessee Open Records Act

- This project is limited to one hard copy deliverable (completed rubric).
- Do not make copies of the rubric. The process is designed to allow for the editing of the rubric at each stage of the evaluation.
- In addition, do not email your team members with comments and questions pertaining to the ratings for any authorizer. Discuss your ratings during the allotted times, or schedule additional times.

Consider Conflicts of Interest

- Review documents for conflicts or perceived conflicts. If a conflict (or a question) exists, contact the Project Manager prior to engaging in the evaluation.

Document Folder

- Please do not generate multiple documents. Save/update the rubric within the folder.

Evaluation Cycle – Each Authorizer

Pre-Evaluation (Summer/early Fall)

During the summer prior to evaluations, the State Board conducts an orientation for authorizers regarding the standards, ratings, documents, evaluation process, and submission process. Every authorizer being evaluated that year is required to attend; off-year authorizers may attend if they please.

In late summer or early fall, the State Board hosts a training for the evaluation team members. Evaluator training is mandatory and will occur approximately one month prior to the first evaluation. The training occurs annually and includes:

- An overview of the evaluation and scoring processes
- A review of the rubric
- Norming on ratings and the writing of evaluative comments

The State Board will contact the authorizer in advance of the documentation debrief to schedule the dates and times, provide debrief logistics, and request a list of the standards the authorizer plans to discuss during the document debrief. The authorizer will provide State Board with the names of document debrief participants.

The State Board will also contact the school leaders from the authorizer’s portfolio in advance of the evaluation to schedule the dates and times for the school leader interview and provide debrief logistics.

In early fall, authorizers will submit documents, as detailed later in this document. Each authorizer evaluation follows a similar process. Table 1 outlines the steps to complete as a Lead, Team Member, or Quality Editor.

Table 1: Steps in the Process (Team)

Days	Lead	Team Members	Quality Editor
Day 1 (Monday) <i>or sooner if you want to start early</i>	Access Documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents are available to the evaluation team one week prior to the evaluation. • Access documents and click on the corresponding authorizer folder. 	Access Documents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access documents and click on the corresponding authorizer folder. 	
Days 1-2 (Mon-Tues)	Document Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review documents • Rate all standards • Draft evaluative comments for every standard • Submit initial evaluation by EOD Tuesday. 	Document Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review documents • Rate all standards • Draft evaluative comments for every standard • Submit initial evaluation by EOD Tuesday. 	
Day 3 (Wed)	School Leader Interview (AM) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation debrief – AM, virtual (60 minutes) hard-scheduled. • Pose standardized questions to the authorizer’s school leaders Pre-debrief call (PM) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine rubrics to one. • Pre-debrief call (90 minutes) via phone 	School Leader Interview (AM) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation debrief – AM, virtual (60 minutes) hard-scheduled. • Listen to standardized questions to the authorizer’s school leaders • Record answers to questions Pre-debrief call (PM) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-debrief call (90 minutes) via phone 	
Day 4 (PM)	Authorizer Document debrief (AM) (optional) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation debrief virtual (up to 2 hours) hard-scheduled. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Facilitate meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present scripted meeting introduction 	Authorizer Document debrief (AM) (optional) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation debrief virtual (up to 2 hours) hard-scheduled. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Take notes of authorizer responses • Post-documentation debrief (30 minutes) Consensus Meeting (PM)	Consensus Meeting (PM) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads the call • Skim ratings/findings before call • Two-hour phone call (hard scheduled). • Listen to presentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clarify ratings as needed. ○ Clarify evidence as needed.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The authorizer identifies the standards to be discussed and presents/discusses the evidence ▪ Present scripted closing/next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post-documentation debrief (30 minutes) <p>Consensus Meeting (PM)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two-hour phone call (hard scheduled). • Present the consensus findings to Quality Editor • Per discussion, note adjustments to rubric ratings to prepare for writing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two-hour phone call (hard scheduled). • Participate fully under direction of Lead. <p><i>(Following the consensus meeting, the Team Members are done.)</i></p>	
Day 5 (Friday)	<p>Report out findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of the 24 preliminary ratings; • Provide the Authorizer with a summary of the team’s ratings. • 30 minutes, virtual <p>Write and submit the Rubric</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the rubric ratings and language consistent with writing guidance. • Finalize completed rubric and save it to the document folder <u>by or before 5:00 p.m. Monday.</u> • Email Quality Editor to notify them that evaluation is ready for quality editing. 		
Day 8-10 (Mon-Wed)			<p>Quality editing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access draft via the document folder and conduct the initial review of rubric. • Make terminology and/or grammatical edits to drafted evaluative comments. • Complete review and save to the document folder <u>by or before 5:00 p.m. Wednesday.</u> • Send an email to the Lead and PM to notify them that quality editing has been completed. • <i>(if needed) Notify PM at this point with clarification questions.</i>
Day 10-11 (Wed-Thurs)	<p>Quality editing (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access draft via the document folder to review Quality Editor’s changes • Update the evaluation according to comments/suggestions from the Quality Editor. • Finalize edits and save updated rubric to the document folder <u>by or before 5:00 p.m. Thursday.</u> • Email the Quality Editor to notify them that the updates have been completed. 		
Day 12 (Friday)	<p>Finalizing the rubric report and submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access any updates via the document folder and conduct the final edits to update and finalize the rubric. • Delete any remaining editing comments. 		<p>(only as needed) Finalizing the rubric report and submission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access draft via the document folder and conduct the final edits to update and finalize the rubric.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once notified by Quality Editor, finalize and save updated rubric to the document folder, <u>by or before noon Monday</u>. • Email the Quality Editor to notify them of completion. <p><i>(Following this step, the Evaluation Lead is done.)</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete any remaining editing comments. • Finalize and save updated rubric to the document folder, <u>by or before noon Friday</u>. • Email the Lead to notify them of completion. <p><i>(Following this step, the Quality Editor is done.)</i></p>
--	---	--	---

Completion of Evaluation

1. Project Manager - Evaluation rubric

- Access rubric via the document folder and eliminate any remaining editorial comments.
- Finalize and save updated rubric to the document folder by or before 9:00 a.m. Wednesday.
- Email the Copy Editor to notify him/her of completion.

2. Copy Editor

- Access rubric via the document folder and conduct copy editing of rubric.
- Review grammar and formatting.
- Finalize and save the final document as “[authorizer name] Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Report - DRAFT” in the document folder by or before 9:00 a.m. Friday.
- Email the Project Manager to notify him/her of completion. Following this step, the Copy Editor is done.

3. Project Manager - Review and save

- Access rubric via the document folder and review rubric.
- Save the final document as “[authorizer name] Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Report - DRAFT” in the document folder by or before 9:00 a.m. Monday.
- Final distribution - Access rubric via the document folder, share the final document as “[authorizer name] Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Report - DRAFT” with authorizer.
- Requesting Report Content Clarifications (Authorizer)
 - In the interest of producing as accurate a report as possible, the authorizer is offered an opportunity to review the draft and submit any errors of a factual nature they may find.
 - The draft is shared with the authorizer in PDF form. Edit suggestions may include names, dates, historical references, program titles, or numbers of schools, etc. The findings expressed in the report at this point are not subject to substantive change and substantiated edit recommendations will be reflected in the final version of the report. The authorizer’s review of the draft evaluation is expected to be internal since the report, at the point of review, is not available for distribution. The authorizer should submit suggested edits in a separate message, indicating page number and paragraph number (if possible).

Evaluation Step-by-Step

Document Review (Days One & Two)

Document Review Requirements:

By or before the end of day two, each evaluator must:

- Review every document uploaded by the authorizer
- Draft ratings for all 24 standards within the rubric
- Draft evaluative comments for all 24 standards within the rubric

Document Review Process:

Each evaluator will work on his/her own copy of the rubric on Days One and Two. Rubrics are in the document folder fielder under subfolders called "Rubrics."

The Evaluation Lead and Team Members conduct independent reviews during days One and Two.

For each standard, the Evaluation Lead and Team Members must:

- Review all authorizer documentation in the document folder for the standard.
- Determine whether the standard applies to the authorizer.
- If the standard does not apply, then rate the standard as "n/a."
- If the standard applies:
 - Review the criteria and guidance, then determine a draft rating.
 - Draft evaluative comments for every applicable criterion in the standard.

Evaluation suggestions:

- Craft evaluative comments consistent with the writing section.
 - ✓ Make general reference to documents per the writing guidance.
 - ✓ Add page references (in parentheses) to evaluative comments for referenced document. These page references are used for consensus discussions on Day Three and must be struck by the Evaluation Lead when finalizing the evaluation.
 - ✓ For example: While PowerPoint slides [21, 24, and 56] from the authorizer's school training session include descriptions of staff responsibilities for every phase of the authorizer's oversight plan, the training session is dated January 2015 and therefore does not apply to the period of this evaluation.
- Team Members - Once the document review and draft evaluative comments have been completed for 24 standards, notify the Evaluation Lead.
- Evaluation Lead - once notified by Team Members of their completion:
 - Review the Team Members' ratings and evaluative comments.
 - Identify inconsistent ratings for pre-documentation debrief consensus call.

Tips for reviewing documents and writing evaluative comments:

- Some evaluators find it useful to print a copy of the blank rubric for reference. This can be helpful when you are in the authorizer document on your computer and simultaneously want to check several sections of the rubric.
- *See end of document for writing guidance.*

School Leader Interview & Pre-Debrief Call (Day Three)

School Leader Interview

Overview:

- The interview is an opportunity for school leaders from the authorizer’s portfolio to respond to questions regarding their authorizer’s expectations and practices.
- School leader interview time is limited to one hour.
- The school leader interview is optional.

Participants:

- School leaders and Evaluation Team

When:

- The school leader interview is conducted on Wednesday morning.
- The Project Manager schedules the interview.

Where:

- The interview is conducted remotely; school leaders and evaluators will participate in the meeting.
- Interview participants may engage in the meeting from multiple locations.
- The Project Manager will send a calendar invitation to the school leaders in advance of every interview. Meeting invitations will contain meeting access info.

Pre-Debrief Consensus Call

Purpose:

- The evaluation team will achieve rating consensus and (ideally) evidence consensus for all 24 standards.

Participants:

- Evaluation Team

When:

- The pre-debrief consensus call is conducted on Wednesday midday or afternoon.
- The Project Manager schedules the pre-debrief consensus call.

Where:

- The pre-debrief consensus call is conducted remotely. Evaluators will participate in the meeting remotely. The Evaluation Lead will share the quality evaluation rubric.
- Meeting participants may engage in the meeting from multiple locations.
- The Project Manager will send a calendar invitation to the school leaders in advance of every meeting. Meeting invitations will contain meeting access info.

What:

- Evaluators connect on the phone for up to 90 minutes.
- Review the rating and evaluative comment (evidence) for each of the 24 standards:
 - For standards with consensus, confirm rating and evidence (*no more than 1 minute per standard*)
 - For standards without consensus:
 - ✓ Determine which evidence applies,
 - ✓ Discuss how the (agreed-to) evidence aligns with rubric ratings, and
 - ✓ Determine and confirm team rating.
- *Time permitting* - Edit evaluative comments.

See page 19 for School Leader Interview Script

Authorizer Document Debrief (Day Four)

Overview:

- The authorizer document debrief is an opportunity for a charter school authorizer to identify how the documentation they have uploaded for the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation aligns with the criteria within the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric.
- Authorizers can set the agenda for the document debrief by identifying the standards they would like to discuss. With each selected standard, an authorizer may present to evaluators how the documentation they uploaded meets the criteria within the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric.

Pre-Work Responsibilities:

- The Project Manager will:
 - Contact the authorizer a month prior to the document debrief to:
 - Schedule the document debrief dates and time.
 - Provide meeting access information.
 - Request a list of the standards the authorizer plans to discuss during the meeting.
- Evaluators will:
 - Review and consider every document the authorizer has uploaded.
 - Draft ratings and evaluative comments for every standard.
 - Engage in a pre-debrief consensus call.
 - The Evaluation Lead combines rubrics.
- The authorizer will:
 - Confirm the meeting date and time.
 - Provide the Project Manager with the names of documentation debrief participants.
 - Submit a list of the standards the organization plans to discuss during the document debrief.

Note: Authorizers may find it beneficial to list standards for discussion in prioritized order

Participants:

- The authorizer may choose up to five individuals to participate in the authorizer document debrief. Typical documentation debrief participants are staff members or consultants who have actively implemented the organization's authorizing responsibilities.
- School staff should not participate in the document debrief.

When:

- Authorizer document debriefs are conducted on Thursday morning.
- The Project Manager schedules the document debrief date and time with the authorizer.
- Document debriefs last up to two hours.

Where:

- The authorizer document debrief is conducted virtually. Authorizer staff and evaluators participate in the meeting.
- The Project Manager will send a calendar invitation to the authorizer and evaluators in advance of every authorizer documentation debrief. Meeting invitations will contain an address and room number.

Steps:

- The authorizer document debrief will be conducted for up to two hours.
- The Evaluation Lead will deliver the welcome and facilitate the introductions of meeting participants. S/he will review meeting ground rules, then verify the standards the authorizer plans to discuss.
- The authorizer can discuss how the evidence it has uploaded that satisfies the criteria within the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric.
- The Evaluation Lead will present the closing and next steps of the evaluation as the final segment of the meeting. Document debriefs are limited to two hours in length and the evaluation team reserves the final five minutes of each documentation debrief for their closing remarks.

Document Debrief Rules:

- The evaluation team reserves the first 15 minutes and last 5 minutes of the document debrief for its use.
- Authorizers may select as many standards as they like to discuss during the document debrief.
 - The authorizer has up to 100 minutes to present to evaluators.
 - For any selected standard, authorizers are expected to discuss the evidence (documentation) they have uploaded.
 - Authorizers will discuss how their evidence/documentation meets the criteria listed in the corresponding section of the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric.
 - The amount of time an authorizer allocates to the presentation of documentation relative to any one standard is determined by them. Authorizers may not use more than the 100 minutes allocated to them.

See page 20 for Authorizer Document Debrief Script

Consensus Call (Day Four)

Purpose: The evaluation team uses the consensus call to present ratings and evidence to the Quality Editor and receive normed feedback to incorporate into the final report.

Basics:

- Consensus calls are conducted virtually on Thursday afternoons and are limited to two hours.
- The Evaluation Lead, Team Members, and Quality Editor participate in the call.

Preparation:

- The Project Manager will schedule a call time and send a calendar invite. The invite will contain any meeting access information.
- The Evaluation Lead needs to update the rubric prior to the call.
 - The rubric must have a rating for every standard; do not leave any undecided.
 - Every standard must have evaluative comments consistent with every rating.
 - The rubric must reflect any discussions and adjustments made following the authorizer documentation debrief.
 - The rubric must be free of notes or comments; make sure it is clean.
- The Evaluation Lead saves the rubric to the document folder in advance of the meeting, then shares the rubric on his/her screen so all participants can view the same document during the call.
- Template email below.

Consensus Call:

- The Evaluation Lead leads the call (no more than two hours).
- The Evaluation Lead presents every standard rating and its evidence in order. Present in order to ensure that every standard is covered, and none are forgotten. Allow participants one-or-two-minutes to silently read the evaluative comments.
- The Team Members are expected to clarify the presentation, as needed, and work with the Evaluation Lead to achieve consensus ratings supported with authorizer evidence.
- The Quality Editor listens to the presentation and asks clarifying questions when the evidence base for a rating is not apparent or reliant on evidence inconsistent with other evaluations.

Call Agenda: (Led by the Evaluation Lead)

- A. Welcome (1 minute)
- B. Purpose of Call/Review of Agenda (4 minutes)
 - Present consensus on the ratings, and evidence for every standard (in sequential order).
 - Clarify ratings that are not normed or support with sufficient evidence.
 - Prepare the Evaluation Lead to finalize the rubric.
- C. Review of Each Standard (4+ minutes per standard = 115 minutes)
- D. Confirm final report delivery deadline – Monday 5:00 p.m. in the document folder.

Quality Editor Responsibilities:

- Accept the document folder invite.
- Rely on Additional Guidance as a reference while each standard is presented.
- Listen actively.
- Ask questions to confirm that ratings that are not normed or supported with sufficient evidence.

Scenarios to help with consensus:

- Scenario 1: The pre-documentation debrief document review indicates the authorizer has uploaded one site visit report per school. During the documentation debrief, the authorizer says it conducts two visits to every school per year, but only offered one report per school “as an example.”
 - **Q - Do we raise the score from what we determined based on the documents alone?**
 - **A - NO, but add an evaluative comment identifying what was said during the documentation debrief.**
Ex: During the documentation debrief, the authorizer stated that it conducts two site visits to every school; however, authorizer documentation includes one site visit report per school.

- Scenario 2: The document review indicates strong/clear artifacts and a high pre-rating. During the documentation debrief, the authorizer offers a response that is inconsistent with the artifacts.
 - **Q - Do we lower the score from what we determined based on the documents alone?**
 - **A - NO. There is no need to note anything about this regarding what the authorizer verbalized during the documentation debrief.**

Report-Out Preliminary Ratings (Day Five)

Purpose:

- Report the preliminary ratings for each of the 24 standards and provide the authorizer with a summary of the team's ratings.

Who:

- Evaluation lead and the authorizer

Where:

- Virtually

When:

- 30-45-minute report-out of the team's ratings to the authorizer on Friday morning. Project Manager schedules the meeting date and time with the evaluation lead and the authorizer.

Guidance:

- Maintain a warm, professional tone throughout the report-out. You may wish to begin by thanking authorizer for their collaboration, openness, and/or hospitality during the process.
- Provide a concise evidence-based summary of each rating.
- Identify two-to-three key pieces of evidence that you will discuss to support each rating before the report-out. This is particularly important for findings you anticipate will be difficult for the authorizer to hear and/or accept.
- Allow the authorizer to ask questions to clarify evidence. Respond to those questions clearly and concisely.
- Explain remaining steps:
 - We will now finalize our ratings and evaluative comments.
 - The State Board will distribute final evaluations to all authorizers in late Fall.
 - Once you receive your final evaluation, you will have an opportunity to make factual corrections.

Writing (Day Five & Six)

Findings and Evaluative Comments

This section outlines the process for, and provides clarification on, completing the final version of the rubric.

- Every applicable sub-standard needs an evaluative comment.
- All evaluative comments should:
 - Identify the (in general terms) applicable documentation used to determine the rating for a standard.
 - Clearly note how the evidence aligns to the criteria of the given rating level.
 - Include enough detail for authorizers and citizens to grasp the reasons for the ratings.
- If no appropriate documents were submitted, the evaluative comment should make this clear.
- Evaluative comments must not include evidence or details inconsistent with the metrics in the rubric.
- What should I keep in mind when I finalize evaluative comments?
 - Make general references to a document in every evaluative comment.
 - A document name or its type should be the subject of an evaluative comment.
 - Avoid using file names. Instead use the common name of the document, such as contract, application, renewal application, termination policy, etc.

Example:

 - *The authorizer guide includes descriptions for the authorizer's three staff positions; the guide details responsibilities for each position.*
 - When the quality of a document does not fully meet the criteria, then a negative comment must be generated. For example:
 - *While PowerPoint slides from a school training session include descriptions of staff responsibilities for every phase of the authorizer's oversight plan, the training session is titled Smith High School orientation which is not an authorized school and, therefore, does not apply to the evaluation.*
- When narrative content refers to a practice or expectation that is not reflected in documentation, it has little impact on the score. Evaluators can add a comment to recognize that the authorizer described the practices, even if it was not documented.

Example:

 - *While the narrative states that the authorizer conducts two site visits to every school per year, the authorizer's documentation does not include reports or other evidence to corroborate the narrative.*
- When the authorizer says a practice or expectation occurs in the documentation debrief, but it is not reflected in documentation, their verbal comment has little impact on the score. Evaluators should include a comment to recognize that the authorizer described the practices, even if it was not documented.

Example:

 - *During the documentation debrief, the authorizer stated that they conduct two site visits to every school, every year; however, documentation does not corroborate this practice.*

Example:

 - *During the documentation debrief, the authorizer stated that it communicates daily with the school and tries to complete formal evaluations monthly; however, documentation does not corroborate this practice.*
- Always check evaluative comments against the rubric language to ensure they are appropriately aligned.

Sample Sentence Frames

- The practice of ____ is articulated in [document name]
- According to [document name], the authorizer does/does not ...
- ...the [document name] does/does not include...
- *Zero* - The authorizer's documentation does not demonstrate/include that...
- *Mixed* - While the _____ shows _____, the authorizer's documentation does not demonstrate/include...

Recommended verbs:

- Documents, articulates, demonstrates, records, makes evident...

Exemplar Comments**Insufficient Documentation**

Rubric Criterion: “The authorizer submitted at least one documented policy and process for its oversight and evaluation system, but there is no evidence that this information was shared with the authorizer’s schools.” [Oversight & Evaluation]

Exemplar Evaluative Comment

<p><i>While the site visit tool indicates that limited areas of academics and operations are reviewed on site at least one time, documentation does not demonstrate a system of oversight. Additionally, the authorizer stated in the documentation debrief that it communicates daily with the school and tries to complete formal evaluations monthly; however, their documentation does not reflect this.</i></p>
--

Alignment with Rubric Metrics

Rubric Criterion: “All reviewed contracts include targets that compare the school’s student performance to the State, schools serving similar populations or schools in the same geographic area.” [Performance Contracting]

Exemplar Evaluative Comment

<p><i>Each of the three contracts contain specific targets for attendance, performance on State assessments, and graduation rates. The contract template also requires each school to define an additional site-specific academic measure in the “Other Goals” section of the performance framework.</i></p>
--

Style Guidance

1. Font – Arial, 11 point
2. Do not use or insert page numbers.
3. School year references – SY2018-19 always. [do not use... “during the 2018-2019 school year” ...]
4. Italics – DO NOT use italics to identify reports.
5. Decimals – Always include a zero in front of every decimal. Ex: 0.3%.
6. When an acronym appears the first time, spell it out and list acronym in parenthesis. For example, English Learners (EL).
7. Board – When referring to a specific governance board, use capital B (Board); when referring to board work or the governance in general terms, use lower case b (board).
8. Use Oxford commas (serial commas).
9. Tense:
 - a. Use present tense (Ex: Site visit reports show...)
 - b. Only use past tense when referring to something the authorizer said during the documentation debrief.
10. Refer to the authorizer by name or as “authorizer”. When referring to the authorizer as a group, you may use “they”. When referring to the authorizer in a singular sense, you may use “it.”
11. Enumeration:
 - a. Spell out 0-9, use numerals for 10 and higher.
 - b. If a number starts a sentence, spell it out.

Authorizer Documents and Submission Process

Authorizers must submit documents that provide evidence of their authorizing practices. When submitting documents and files for the review, authorizers should upload documents that best demonstrate the standard in question. Authorizers are encouraged to submit the most relevant and up-to-date documentation to reflect their current expectations and practices.

School documents are randomly selected for the authorizer evaluation according to the below characteristics. If the required number of documents are missing or the documents fall outside of the two-year review term, the authorizer shall receive a score of zero (0) for any applicable standards. See Appendix B for a complete list of the randomly selected schools for each authorizer.

- New School Applications (2) – A set of application materials from two applicants who have gone through the application process in the last 2 years.
- Charter Agreements (2) – In-force charter agreements from two operational charter schools
- Operational School documents (2):
 - Set of all oversight documentation from one or two pre five-year review schools (potential evidence for each standard is identified in the Additional Guidance)
 - Set of all oversight documentation from one post five-year review school (if any exist)
- Renewals (2) – Set of renewal materials from two schools who have gone through the renewal process (within the last 2 years)
- Revocations (1) – Set of revocation materials from one school (if within last 2 years)
- Closure (1) – Set of closure materials from one school (if within last 2 years)

While authorizers are encouraged to use discretion when uploading documents, there are no page limits.

- If an authorizer uses a tool or process developed by the Tennessee State Department of Education, the deviations/ changes will be considered against the base evaluation of the tool.
- Narrative - Authorizers have the option to enter a brief narrative using the State Board's narrative form template. Narratives are no longer than two single-sided pages and is based on documentation. The narrative form provides the authorizer with an opportunity to rate their evidence against the rubric and describe how the evidence supports their anticipated rating. Narratives should explain ratings and **BOLD** the names of documents referenced in narrative.
- The same uploaded document can be referenced for multiple standards. Authorizers may include explanatory memos with larger documents.
- Highlighting the relevant text in the document is optional but helpful to the evaluation.
- Authorizers are asked to make sure documents and files are easy to open and easy to read. It is the authorizer's responsibility to make sure all uploaded documents and files work properly. Documents and files that cannot be opened or are unreadable could result in a lower score on a standard.
- School leader interview notes and document debrief notes are an evidence source and used to consider with the authorizer documentation.
- Document suggestions can be found in the [Evaluator's Additional Guidance](#).

School Leader Interview Script

Welcome

- Thank you for joining us today, we appreciate having time with you to discuss your authorizer's processes and practices. I am __, I am the Evaluation Lead, my team members are ____.
- Please take a moment to identify your name, title and school's name in the chat section of this call. Also, we would appreciate it if you update your name below your video/picture if it is incorrect.

Ground Rules

- This interview will last up to one hour.
- **The purpose for holding this school leader interview is to collect evidence of your authorizer's processes and practices in relation to the evaluation standards** We have engaged in the review of the documents your authorizer uploaded as part of the evaluation and have evaluated them against the standards identified by the Tennessee State Board of Education. This time aims to help us better understand your authorizer's processes and expectations.
- Review team looks at two sources of evidence: document reviews and interviews to develop professional findings about the quality of your authorizer's expectations and practices.
- This Interviews is confidential.
- **It is very important to know that the evidence collected during this interview has less impact on the evaluator ratings than documentation.** In other words, we rely on the documentation your authorizer uploaded as the primary evidence to support ratings. What you share with us during this interview helps us to understand the documentation.
- We will rely on prepared questions. We may not have enough time to hear from everyone. If any of you want to share additional details, please use the chat. Thank you.

Questions

- Does the authorizer ensure mutual understanding and acceptance of the terms of the charter agreement prior to execution? How/how not?
- Does the authorizer recognize school autonomy? How/how not?
- Does the authorizer communicate effectively? How/how not? Describe the content.
- Does the authorizer oversee and monitor schools? In what ways?
- {If not answered above}, Does the authorizer provide technical guidance? How/how not?
- Does the authorizer conduct site visits? How often and for what purpose?
- Does the authorizer communicate with schools regarding meeting or failing to meet performance expectations or compliance requirements? How/how not?
- Does the authorizer hold schools accountable? How/how not?
- Does the authorizer implement any corrective action plans or interventions? How/how not? What does the authorizer require versus affording you discretion?
- Does the authorizer have a charter amendment process? What would you need to do to amend your charter agreement (i.e., site/grade level/early learning)?
- Is the authorizer's staffing model organized to provide support and oversight to its schools? How/how not?
- Has the authorizer returned any funds from the authorizer fee?
- Is the authorizer able to avoid conflicts of interest? How do you know?
- Does the authorizer address complaints received about schools? How/how not?
- Describe the authorizer's charter school application process.
- Please describe the authorizer's renewal process. How does the authorizer make renewal decisions?

Closing/Next Steps (5 minutes):

- That is all the time we have for this interview, thank you for taking the time to meet with us and answering our questions.
- We will meet with your authorizer tomorrow and then finalize our ratings and evaluative comments over the next week. The State Board will distribute final evaluations to all authorizers in the coming months.

Authorizer Documentation Debrief Script

Welcome

- Thank you for joining us today, we appreciate having time with you to discuss documentation of your authorizing processes.
- My name is _____. I am the Evaluation Lead. I work for the Tennessee State Board of Education.
- My colleagues for this evaluation and documentation debrief are _____.

Ground Rules

- This Documentation debrief will last up to two hours.
- **The purpose for holding this authorizer documentation debrief is to give your organization an opportunity to identify how the documentation you have uploaded for the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation aligns with the criteria in the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric.**
- **It is very important to know that the authorizer documentation debrief has less impact on the evaluator ratings than documentation.** In other words, we rely on the documentation you uploaded as the primary evidence to support ratings. What you share with us during this meeting helps us to understand the documentation you have already submitted.
- We will use the first 15 minutes of this meeting and the last 5 minutes. The remainder of the scheduled time is yours.
- You have selected standards to discuss.
 - You have up to 100 minutes to present to us. We may ask clarifying questions; we will limit the time used for clarifying questions.
 - You may choose the order and length of time devoted to each standard; you may not use more than the 100 minutes allocated to you.
 - For any selected standard, you are expected to discuss the evidence (documentation) you have uploaded.
 - Your task is to discuss how the evidence/documentation meets the criteria listed in the corresponding section of the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric. Feel free to reference the standard criteria listed on the screen.
- We have engaged in the review of the documents you uploaded as part of your quality evaluation and have evaluated them against the standards identified by the Tennessee State Board of Education. This time aims to help us understand your processes and expectations, but mainly to understand the documents you have uploaded.

Introductions

- Our team will start with introductions, then we would like to learn your names and your titles.
- I am _____, I am the Evaluation Lead.
- (Team Member) I am _____, I am the Team Member.
- (authorizer team) I am _____, I work for _____ and serve as _____.
- Thank you.
- You may use the next 100 minutes to discuss the evidence you have submitted for selected standards.
- We will close the documentation debrief with a review of Next Steps.

[Authorizer Time - up to 100 minutes]

Closing/Next Steps (5 minutes):

- Thank you for taking the time to meet with us. This ends the time your organization has been allocated to engage with the evaluation team.
- We will now finalize our ratings and evaluative comments.
- The State Board will distribute final evaluations to all authorizers in December.
- Once you receive your final evaluation, you will have an opportunity to make factual corrections.

Appendix A



Charter School Authorizer Evaluations Evaluation Rubric 2021



Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]

Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Overall Ratings Summary:

Standard		Rating (0-4)	Average
1a	Planning and Commitment to Excellence		
1b	Human Resources		
1c	Financial Resources		
2a	Application Proposal Information, Questions, and Guidance		
2b	Fair, Transparent, Quality-Focused Procedures		
2c	Rigorous Approval Criteria		
2d	Rigorous Decision Making		
2e	Elements for Existing School Operators or Replicators (if applicable)		
2f	Elements for Applicants Proposing to Contract with Educational Service Providers, including Charter Management Organizations (if applicable)		
3a	Charter Agreement Term, Negotiation, and Execution		
3b	Rights and Responsibilities		
3c	Performance Standards		
3d	Provisions for Educational Service Provider (ESP) Contracts (if applicable)		
3e	ESP Contracts Additional Provisions.		
4a	Performance Evaluation and Compliance Monitoring		
4b	Respecting School Autonomy		
4c	Protecting Student Rights		
4d	School Intervention		
4e	Public Reporting		
5a	Revocation		
5b	Renewal Decisions Based on Merit and Inclusive Evidence		
5c	Cumulative Report and Renewal Application		
5d	Fair, Transparent Process		
5e	Closure		
6a	Advanced Standard (Bonus)		
Overall Rating			

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard



Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]

Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 1a - Planning and Commitment to Excellence	0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>					
i. Supports and advances the purposes of charter school law.					
ii. Ensures that the authorizer’s local board of education or authorizing board, leadership, and staff understand and are committed to the quality charter authorizing principles and standards and developing as authorizing professionals.					
iii. Defines external relationships and lines of authority to protect its authorizing functions from conflicts of interest and political influence.					
iv. Implements policies, processes, and practices that streamline and systematize its work toward stated goals and executes its duties efficiently while minimizing administrative burdens on schools.					
v. Evaluates its work regularly against national and state standards for quality authorizing and recognized effective practices and develops and implements timely plans for improvement when necessary.					
vi. States a clear mission for quality authorizing.					
vii. Makes authorizing decisions that will result in positive student outcomes, in accordance with state law.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>					

Explanation (limited to 500 words):

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 1b. - Human Resources		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Through intra- or inter-agency collaborations, contractual relationships and/or staff, enlists expertise and competent leadership for all areas essential to charter school oversight—including, but not limited to, education leadership; instruction; assessment; local community needs; special education, English learners, and other diverse learning needs; performance management and accountability; law; finance; facilities; and nonprofit governance and management.					
ii.	Employs competent personnel at a staffing level appropriate and sufficient to carry out all authorizing responsibilities in accordance with national and state standards, and commensurate with the scale of the charter school portfolio.					
iii.	Demonstrates an on-going commitment to developing and retaining authorizing staff members and provides regular professional development for the agency’s leadership and local board of education or authorizing board to achieve and maintain high standards of professional authorizing practice and to enable continual agency improvement.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Standard 1c – Financial Resources		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Determines the financial needs of the authorizing office and devotes financial resources to fulfill its authorizing responsibilities in accordance with national and state standards, commensurate with the scale of the charter school portfolio, and in accordance with Tennessee statute, including all relevant requirements for use of the authorizer fee.					
ii.	Structures its funding in a manner that avoids conflicts of interest, inducements, incentives, or disincentives that might compromise its judgment in charter approval and accountability decision making.					
iii.	Deploys funds effectively, transparently, and efficiently with the public and student interests in mind.					
iv.	Annually reports the authorizing obligations fulfilled using the authorizer fee in accordance with state law.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 2a - Proposal Information, Questions, and Guidance		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Issues a charter application information packet or request for proposals (RFP) that: a) States any chartering priorities the authorizer may have established; b) Articulates comprehensive application questions to elicit the information needed for rigorous evaluation of applicants' plans and capacities; and c) Provides clear guidance and requirements regarding application content and format, while explaining evaluation criteria.					
ii.	Welcomes proposals from first-time charter applicants as well as existing school operators/replicators, while appropriately distinguishing between the two kinds of applicants in proposal requirements and evaluation criteria.					
iii.	Encourages expansion of charter schools that demonstrate academic success, financial viability, organizational health, and capacity for growth.					
iv.	Encourages replication of charter schools that demonstrate academic success, financial viability, organizational health, and capacity for growth.					
v.	Considers diverse educational philosophies and approaches.					
vi.	Requires applicants to demonstrate capacity to serve students with diverse needs, such as students with disabilities or learning exceptionalities and English learners.					
Standard Rating						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 2b - Fair, Transparent, Quality-focused Procedures.		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Implements a charter application process that is open, well-publicized, and transparent, and is organized around clear, realistic timelines.					
ii.	Allows sufficient time for each stage of the application and school pre-opening process to be carried out with quality and integrity.					
iii.	Explains how each stage of the application process is conducted and evaluated.					
iv.	Communicates the education needs of the district, the charter authorizing processes, approval criteria, and decisions clearly to the public.					
v.	Informs applicants of their rights and responsibilities and promptly notifies applicants of approval or denial, while explaining the factors that determined the decision so that applicants can decide if they wish to revise their plans based in part on that information and resubmit in the future.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 2c - Rigorous Approval Criteria.		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Requires all applicants to present a clear and compelling mission, a quality educational program, a demonstration of community support, a solvent and sustainable budget and contingency financial plans, a clear demonstration of the effectiveness of the model for the target student population, effective governance and management structures and systems, founding team members demonstrating diverse and necessary capabilities in all phases of the school's development, and clear evidence of the applicant's capacity to execute its plan successfully.					
ii.	Establishes distinct requirements and criteria for applicants who are existing school operators or replicators.					
iii.	Establishes distinct requirements and criteria for applicants proposing to contract with educational service providers (ESPs), including charter management organizations.					
Standard Rating						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 2d - Rigorous Decision Making.		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Grants charters only to applicants that have demonstrated competence and capacity to succeed in all aspects of their particular charter school model, consistent with the stated approval criteria.					
ii.	Rigorously evaluates each application through thorough review of the written proposal, a substantive in-person interview with each qualified applicant, and all appropriate due diligence to examine the applicant's experience and capacity, conducted by knowledgeable and competent evaluators.					
iii.	Engages, for both written application reviews and applicant interviews, highly competent teams of internal and external evaluators with relevant educational, organizational (governance and management), financial, and legal expertise, as well as thorough understanding of the essential principles of charter school autonomy and accountability.					
iv.	Provides orientation or training to application evaluators (including interviewers) to ensure consistent evaluation standards and practices, the elimination of real or perceived conflicts of interest, the observance of essential protocols, and the fair, unbiased treatment of all applicants.					
v.	Ensures that the application-review process and decision making are free of conflicts of interest, and requires full disclosure of any potential or perceived conflicts of interest between reviewers or decision makers and applicants.					
vi.	Approves applications that are comprised of a detailed plan for charter school opening, operation, and fiscal stability, with little substantive work left for later development.					
Standard Rating						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard



Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]

Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 2e - Elements for Existing School Operators or Applications (if applicable).		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Provide clear evidence of their capacity to operate new schools successfully while maintaining quality in existing schools;					
ii.	Document their educational, organizational, and financial performance records based on all existing schools;					
iii.	Explain any never-opened, terminated, or non-renewed schools (including terminated or non-renewed third-party contracts to operate schools);					
iv.	Present their growth plan, business plan, and most recent financial audits;					
v.	Meet high standards of academic, organizational, and financial success to earn approval for replication; and					
vi.	Document any current or past litigation and the resolution of such litigation.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 2f - Elements for Applicants Proposing to Contract with Educational Service Providers, including Charter Management Organizations (if applicable).		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Evidence of the service provider's educational and management success;					
ii.	A description of the process for selecting the ESP;					
iii.	A draft (or existing) service/management contract that sets forth proposed key terms, including roles and responsibilities of the school governing board, the school staff, and the service provider; the services and resources to be provided; performance-evaluation measures and mechanisms; detailed explanation of compensation to be paid to the provider; financial controls and oversight; investment disclosure; methods of contract oversight and enforcement; and conditions for contract renewal and termination; and					
iv.	Disclosure and explanation of any existing or potential conflicts of interest between the school governing board and proposed service provider or any affiliated business entities.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 3a - Charter Agreement Term, Negotiation, and Execution.		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Executes a charter agreement with a legally incorporated governing board independent of the authorizer.					
ii.	Grants charter agreements for an initial term of ten operating years with a high-stakes review every five years, in addition to annual performance reports.					
iii.	Defines material and non-material terms of the charter agreement.					
iv.	Ensures mutual understanding and acceptance of the terms of the charter agreement by the school's governing board.					
v.	Allows—and requires charter agreement amendments for—occasional material changes to a school's plans but does not require amending the charter agreement for non-material modifications.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 3b. - Rights and Responsibilities.		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i. Executes charter agreements that clearly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. State the rights and responsibilities of the school and the authorizer; b. State and respect the autonomies to which schools are entitled—based on statute, waiver, or authorizer policy—including those relating to the school’s authority over educational programming, staffing, budgeting, and scheduling; c. Define performance standards, criteria, and conditions for renewal, intervention, revocation, and non-renewal, while establishing the consequences for meeting or not meeting standards or conditions; d. State the statutory, regulatory, and procedural terms and conditions for the school’s operation; e. State reasonable pre-opening requirements or conditions for new schools to ensure that they meet all health, safety, and other legal requirements prior to opening and are prepared to open smoothly; f. State the responsibility and commitment of the school to adhere to essential public-education obligations, including admitting and serving all eligible students so long as space is available, and not expelling or counseling out students except pursuant to a legal discipline policy approved by the authorizer; and g. State the responsibilities of the school and the authorizer in the event of school closures. 						
ii. Ensures that any fee-based services that the authorizer provides are set forth in a services agreement that respects charter school autonomy and treats the charter school equitably compared to district schools, if applicable; and ensures that purchasing such services is explicitly not a condition of charter approval, continuation, or renewal.						
Standard Rating						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard



Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]

Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 3c. - Performance Standards	0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards					
i. Executes charter agreements that plainly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Establish the performance standards under which schools will be evaluated, using objective and verifiable measures of student achievement as the primary measure of school quality, in accordance with state law; b. Define clear, measurable, and attainable academic, financial, and organizational performance standards and targets that the school must meet as a condition of renewal, including but not limited to state and federal measures; (See Paragraph ii., Performance standards detailed information.) c. Include expectations for appropriate access, education, support services, and outcomes for students with disabilities; d. Define the sources of academic data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation, including state-mandated and other standardized assessments, student academic growth measures, internal assessments, qualitative reviews, and performance comparisons with other public schools in the district and state; e. Define the sources of financial data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation, grounded in professional standards for sound financial operations and sustainability; f. Define the sources of organizational data that will form the evidence base for ongoing and renewal evaluation, focusing on fulfillment of legal obligations, fiduciary duties, and sound public stewardship; and g. Include clear, measurable performance standards to judge the effectiveness of alternative model schools, as defined by state law—requiring and appropriately weighting rigorous mission-specific performance measures and metrics that credibly demonstrate each school’s success in fulfilling its mission and serving its special population. 					
ii. Sets detailed performance standards. Performance standards enable schools and authorizers to know the outcomes for which authorizers will hold schools accountable. They are the basis for school evaluation and should be incorporated in the charter agreement, commonly as an attachment. Academic, financial, and organizational performance standards should include clearly defined and measurable indicators, measures, metrics, and targets that:					

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

<p>a) Academic Performance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set expectations for student academic achievement status or proficiency, including comparative proficiency; 2. Set expectations for student academic growth, including adequacy of growth toward state standards; 3. Incorporate state and federal accountability systems, including state grading and/or rating systems; 4. Set expectations for postsecondary readiness, including graduation rates (for high schools); and 5. Provide schools an option to incorporate mission-specific performance measures for which the school has presented valid, reliable, and rigorous means of assessment approved by the authorizer. <p>b) Financial Performance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enable the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school's financial stability and viability based on short-term performance; and 2. Enable the authorizer to monitor and evaluate the school's long-term financial sustainability. <p>c) Organizational Performance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define the essential elements of the educational program for which the authorizer will hold the school accountable; 2. Define financial management and oversight standards based on generally accepted accounting principles; 3. Hold school governing boards accountable for meeting statutory and board-established operating and reporting requirements; 4. Ensure school compliance with student and employee rights and obligations; and 5. Establish expectations related to the school environment, including health and safety, transportation, facilities, and appropriate handling of records. 					
---	--	--	--	--	--

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

	<i>Standard Rating</i>
--	------------------------

Explanation (limited to 500 words):

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Standard 3d - Provisions for Educational Service Provider (ESP) Within Charter Agreement (if applicable).					
Sub-standards					
	0	1	2	3	4
i. Includes, for any school that contracts with an ESP provider for the management of its educational program, finances, or school operations, contractual provisions that: ¹ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly establish the primacy of the charter agreement over the ESP contract; Clearly identify the school governing board as the party ultimately responsible for the success or failure of the school, and clearly define the ESP as a vendor of services; Prohibit the ESP from selecting, approving, employing, compensating, or serving as school governing board members; Provide for sufficient transparency around the spending of public monies; and Require all instructional materials, furnishings, and equipment purchased or developed with public funds to be the property of the school, not the ESP, in compliance with state law. 					
<i>Standard Rating</i>					
Explanation (limited to 500 words):					

¹ The standard does not apply to contracts with ESPs that do not have substantial responsibility for education, operational, and financial operations such as for payroll, textbooks, curriculum, etc.

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 3e - Provisions for ESP Contract		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	The roles and responsibilities of the school governing board and the ESP, including all services to be provided under the contract;					
ii.	The performance measures, consequences, and mechanisms by which the school governing board will hold the ESP accountable for performance, aligned with the performance measures in the charter agreement;					
iii.	All compensation to be paid to the ESP including all fees, bonuses, and what such compensation includes or requires;					
iv.	Terms of any facility agreement that may be part of the relationship;					
v.	Financial reporting requirements and provisions for the school governing board's financial oversight;					
vi.	All other financial terms of the contract, including disclosure and documentation of all loans or investments by the ESP to the school, and provision for the disposition of assets in accordance with law;					
vii.	Assurances that the school governing board, at all times, maintains independent fiduciary oversight and authority over the school budget and ultimate responsibility for the school's performance;					
viii.	Provisions for contract termination; and					
ix.	Respective responsibilities of the governing board and ESP in the event of school closure, including transparency in the school's revenues and expenditures, as well as those managed by the ESP.					
Standard Rating						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 4a - Performance Evaluation and Compliance Monitoring.		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Implements a comprehensive performance accountability and compliance monitoring system that is defined by the charter agreement and provides the information necessary to make rigorous and standards-based renewal, revocation, and intervention decisions.					
ii.	Defines and communicates to schools the process, methods, and timing of gathering and reporting school performance and compliance data.					
iii.	Implements an accountability system that effectively streamlines federal, state, and local performance expectations and compliance requirements while protecting schools' legally entitled autonomy and minimizing schools' administrative and reporting burdens.					
iv.	Provides clear technical guidance to schools as needed to ensure timely compliance with applicable rules and regulations.					
v.	Visits each school as appropriate and necessary for collecting data that cannot be obtained otherwise and in accordance with the contract, while ensuring that the frequency, purposes, and methods of such visits respect school autonomy, minimize administrative burdens, and avoid operational interference.					
vi.	Evaluates each school annually on its performance and progress toward meeting the standards and targets stated in the charter agreement, including essential compliance requirements, and clearly communicates evaluation results to the school's governing board and leadership.					
vii.	Requires and reviews annual financial audits of schools, conducted by a qualified independent auditor.					
viii.	Communicates regularly with schools as needed, including both the school leaders and governing boards, and provides timely notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies.					
ix.	Provides an annual written report to each school, summarizing its performance and compliance to date and identifying areas of strength and areas needing improvement.					
x.	Articulates and enforces stated consequences for failing to meet performance expectations or compliance requirements.					

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

	<i>Standard Rating</i>
--	------------------------

Explanation (limited to 500 words):

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 4b - Respecting School Autonomy.		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Respects the school's authority over its day-to-day operations.					
ii.	Collects information from the school in a manner that minimizes administrative burdens on the school, while ensuring that performance and compliance information is collected with sufficient detail and timeliness to protect student and public interests.					
iii.	Periodically reviews compliance requirements and evaluates the potential to increase school autonomy based on flexibility in the law, streamlining requirements, demonstrated school performance, or other considerations.					
iv.	Refrains from directing or participating in educational decisions or choices that are appropriately within a school's purview under the charter law or contract.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Standard 4c - Protecting Student Rights.		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Ensures that schools admit students through a random selection process that is open to all students, is publicly verifiable, and does not establish undue barriers to application (such as mandatory information meetings, mandated volunteer service, or parent contracts) that exclude students as provided by federal, state, and local law.					
ii.	Ensures that schools provide equitable access and inclusive services to all students as required by applicable federal and state law, including, but not limited to, students with disabilities, English learners, homeless students, students in foster care, migrant students, and gifted students.					
iii.	Ensures clarity in the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in serving students with disabilities.					
iv.	Ensures that schools' student discipline policies and actions are legal, fair, and equitable and that no student is suspended, expelled, or counseled out of a school outside of that process, and that schools have a clear process for addressing parent/ community grievances.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 4d - School Intervention		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Establishes and clearly communicates to schools at the outset an intervention and problem-solving policy that states the general conditions that may trigger intervention and the types of actions and consequences that may ensue.					
ii.	Gives schools clear, adequate, evidence-based, and timely notice of contract violations or performance deficiencies.					
iii.	Allows schools reasonable time and opportunity for remediation in non-emergency situations.					
iv.	Applies professional discretion when intervention is needed and considers context and a range of effective solutions.					
v.	Where intervention is needed, engages in intervention strategies that clearly preserve school autonomy and responsibility (identifying what the school must remedy without prescribing solutions) while clearly stating possible consequences for noncompliance.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard



Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]

Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 4e - Public Reporting.		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i. Produces an annual public report that provides clear, accurate performance data for the charter schools it oversees and reports on individual school and overall portfolio performance according to the framework set forth in the charter agreement in accordance with State law.						
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 5a - Revocation		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Revokes a charter during the charter term if there is clear evidence of extreme underperformance or violation of law or the public trust that imperils students or public funds, in accordance with state law.					
ii.	Does not make revocation decisions on the basis of political or community pressure.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 5b - Renewal Decisions Based on Merit and Inclusive Evidence.		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Bases the renewal process and renewal decisions on thorough analyses of a comprehensive body of objective evidence defined by the performance framework in the charter agreement.					
ii.	Grants renewal only to schools that have achieved the standards and targets stated in the charter agreement, are organizationally and fiscally viable, and have been faithful to the terms of the contract and applicable law.					
iii.	Does not make renewal decisions on the basis of political or community pressure or solely on promises of future improvement.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 5c - Cumulative Report and Renewal Application.		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Provides to each school, in advance of the renewal decision, a cumulative performance report that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Summarizes the school’s performance record over the charter term; and b. States the authorizer’s summative findings concerning the school’s performance and its prospects for renewal. 					
ii.	Requires any school seeking renewal to apply for it through a renewal application, which provides the school a meaningful opportunity and reasonable time to respond to the cumulative report; to correct the record, if needed; and to present additional evidence regarding its performance.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 5d - Fair, Transparent Process.		0	1	2	3	4
Sub-standards						
i.	Clearly communicates to schools the criteria for charter revocation, renewal, and non-renewal decisions that are consistent with the charter agreement, including any policy changes thereto.					
ii.	Promptly notifies each school of its renewal (or, if applicable, revocation) decision, including written explanation of the reasons for the decision.					
iii.	Promptly communicates renewal or revocation decisions to the school community and public within a time frame that allows parents and students to exercise choices for the upcoming school year.					
iv.	Explains in writing any available rights of legal or administrative appeal through which a school may challenge the authorizer's decision, including appeal to the Tennessee Public Charter School Commission.					
v.	Regularly updates and publishes the process for renewal decision making, including guidance regarding required content and format for renewal applications.					
Standard Rating						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 5e - Closure		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	In the event of a school closure, oversees and works with the school governing board and leadership in carrying out a detailed closure protocol that ensures timely notification to parents; orderly transition of students and student records to new schools; and disposition of school funds, property, and assets in accordance with law.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Charter School Authorizer Evaluation [YEAR]
Authorizer: [NAME OF AUTHORIZER]

Standard 6 - Advanced Standards (Optional)		0	1	2	3	4
<i>Sub-standards</i>						
i.	Ensures authorizing is visible, adequately resourced, and the people responsible for day-to-day authorizing functions have input over decision making.					
ii.	Articulates and implements an intentional strategic vision and plan for chartering, including clear priorities, goals, and time frames for achievement.					
iii.	Evaluates its work regularly against its chartering mission and strategic plan goals, and implements plans for improvement when falling short of its mission and strategic plan.					
iv.	Provides an annual public report on the authorizer's program and performance in meeting its strategic plan goals.					
v.	Broadly invites and solicits charter applications while publicizing the authorizer's strategic vision and chartering priorities, without restricting or refusing to review applications that propose to fulfill other goals.					
<i>Standard Rating</i>						
Explanation (limited to 500 words):						

0	1	2	3	4
No explanation or documentation	Narrative and/or documentation addresses and satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses most but satisfies less than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies more than 50% of the standard	Documentation addresses and satisfies 100% of the standard

Appendix B



Charter School Authorizer Evaluations Selected Schools Template

Selected Schools: These are the schools that were randomly selected for each authorizer. For many rubric sections, the evaluation should focus on documents from these schools only.

Authorizer:		
<i>Primary Standard</i>	<i>Documents</i>	<i>Schools</i>
2	Charter Applications (2)	
3	Charter Agreements (2)	
4	Operational School Documents <i>pre-five-year review (1)</i> <i>-at least: annual reports, financial audits, and site visit reports</i>	
4	Operational School Documents <i>post-five-year review (1)</i> <i>-at least: annual reports, financial audits, and site visit, interim review (5yrs)</i>	
5	Renewals (2)	
5	Revocations (1)	
5	Closure (1)	

Authorizer:		
<i>Primary Standard</i>	<i>Documents</i>	<i>Schools</i>
2	Charter Applications (2)	
3	Charter Agreements (2)	
4	Operational School Documents	

	<i>pre-five-year review (1)</i> <i>-at least: annual reports, financial audits, and site visit reports</i>	
4	Operational School Documents <i>post-five-year review (1)</i> <i>-at least: annual reports, financial audits, and site visit, interim review (5yrs)</i>	
5	Renewals (2)	
5	Revocations (1)	
5	Closure (1)	

Authorizer:		
<i>Primary Standard</i>	<i>Documents</i>	<i>Schools</i>
2	Charter Applications (2)	
3	Charter Agreements (2)	
4	Operational School Documents <i>pre-five-year review (1)</i> <i>-at least: annual reports, financial audits, and site visit reports</i>	
4	Operational School Documents <i>post-five-year review (1)</i> <i>-at least: annual reports, financial audits, and site visit, interim review (5yrs)</i>	
5	Renewals (2)	
5	Revocations (1)	
5	Closure (1)	